

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 20113451

Issue No: 3020

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

November 29, 2010

Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Respondent's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 29, 2010. Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in the respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), MAC R 400.3130(5), or MAC R 400.3187(5).

ISSUE

Did the department act properly in trying to recover a FAP overissuance that Respondent received due to department error?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Respondent has been a FAP recipient at all times relevant to this matter.
2. The department ran a consolidated inquiry on August 25, 2009, which showed Respondent's earned income. Due to an error by the department, the department failed to count Respondent's earned income in determining Respondent's eligibility for FAP benefits. (Department Exhibit #1).

3. As a result of the department error, Respondent received a \$1,306.00 FAP overissuance during the period of December 2009 through September 2010. (Department Exhibit #2).
4. On September 27, 2010, the department sent Respondent written notice of the FAP overissuance, a DHS-4358-A, requesting that she repay it. (Department Exhibit #7).
5. On October 29, 2010, the department received Respondent's hearing request, protesting the department's determination that she must repay the FAP overissuance that she received due to the department's error.
6. The department's recoupment action was deleted pending this hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program) is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

All earned and unearned income available to the Respondent is countable. Earned income means income received from another person or organization or from self-employment for duties that were performed for compensation or profit. Unearned income means all income that is not earned, including but not limited to funds received from the Family Independence Program (FIP), State Disability Assistance (SDA), Child Development and Care (CDC), Medicaid (MA), Social Security Benefits (RSDI/SSI), Veterans Administration (VA), Unemployment Compensation Benefits (UCB), Adult Medical Program (AMA), alimony, and child support payments. The amount counted may be more than the client actually receives because the gross amount is used prior to any deductions. BEM 500.

The Department determines a client's eligibility for program benefits based on the client's actual income and/or prospective income. Actual income is income that was already received. Prospective income is income not yet received but expected. Prospective budgeting is the best estimate of the client's future income. BEM 505.

All income is converted to a standard monthly amount. If the client is paid weekly, the Department multiplies the average weekly amount by 4.3. If the client is paid every other week, the Department multiplies the average bi-weekly amount by 2.15. BEM 505.

An overissuance is the amount of benefits issued to the client group in excess of what they were eligible to receive. BAM 705. The amount of the overissuance is the amount of benefits the group actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720. When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700.

Department errors are caused by incorrect actions by the Department. BAM 705. Department error overissuances are not pursued if the estimated overissuance is less than \$125 per program. BAM 700. Client errors occur when the customer gave incorrect or incomplete information to the Department. Client errors are not established if the overissuance is less than \$125 unless the client group is active for the overissuance program, or the overissuance is a result of a quality control audit finding. BAM 700.

Respondent is an on going FAP recipient and received FAP benefits from December 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010. The department discovered Respondent's earned income during a consolidated inquiry on August 25, 2009, but, due to department error, this earned income was not used to determine Respondent's eligibility for FAP benefits, resulting in Respondent receiving a total FAP overissuance of \$1,306.00.

Based on the evidence and testimony available during the hearing, the department has established that Respondent received a \$1,306.00 FAP overissuance, which the department is required to recoup.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department established that Respondent received a \$1,306.00 FAP overissuance due to department error.

The department's recoupment of overissued FAP benefits is AFFIRMED. It is SO ORDERED.


/s/
Vicki L. Armstrong
Administrative Law Judge
For Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 6, 2010

Date Mailed: December 7, 2010

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 60 days of the filing of the original request.

The Respondent may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

VLA / 

cc: 